

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CLARA VARGAS,

Plaintiff,

No. 14-10493

v.

District Judge David M. Lawson  
Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen

CITY OF NOVI, MACY'S, KELLY  
SERVICES, INFO TREE SERVICES,  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, LEE  
GAVIN, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, NISSAN  
MOTOR COMPANY, INC., and UNITED  
STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Clara Vargas, a *pro se* litigant in this civil case, has filed the following motions:

- Motion to Take Deposition [Doc. #81]
- Motion to Strike Pleadings [Doc. #84]
- Motion for Discovery and Disclosure [Doc. #87]
- Department of Defense Motion to Grant Claim [Doc. #89] (?)
- Motion to Reach Judgment under Rule 54 [Doc.#95]<sup>1</sup>

In terms of any motions for depositions or other discovery [Doc. #81 and #87], Ms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although appearing *pro se*, Ms. Vargas is registered as an e-filer, and thus docketts her motions. However, the designations in her docket entries do not always correspond to the title or purpose of the motion. For example, motion #95 is docketed as a "motion for more definite statement," but the motion is titled a "motion to reach judgment under Rule 54."

Vargas does not contend that the Defendant has failed to comply with any discovery requests, or that she has even made any such requests as provided for under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Her motion to strike pleadings [Doc. #84] does not indicate what pleadings she wants stricken. Her motion to reach judgment [Doc. #95] discusses adding claims and parties, but does not indicate which claims and parties she wishes to add. And to the extent that motion asks for entry of judgment, she has offered absolutely no argument in support of that relief.<sup>2</sup> In any event, I have filed a Report and Recommendation that recommends dismissal of the City of Novi, the only Defendant that has been served.

As to Motion #89, involving the Department of Defense and access to Fort Bliss, I have no idea what Ms. Vargas is talking about, but it has nothing to do with this case.

So, Plaintiffs motions [#81, #84, #87, #89, and #95] are all DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/R. Steven Whalen  
R. STEVEN WHALEN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: January 21, 2015

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on January 21, 2015, electronically and/or by U.S. mail.

s/Carolyn M. Ciesla  
Case Manager

---

<sup>2</sup> Her motion [Doc. #54] cites Fed.R.Civ.P. 54, which governs the procedure for entry of judgment, not Rule 56, upon which the Court would decide based on substantive factual and legal issues.